



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/646,852	09/22/2000	Per Johan Lundberg	1103326-0686	1116

7470 7590 12/01/2006

WHITE & CASE LLP  
PATENT DEPARTMENT  
1155 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS  
NEW YORK, NY 10036

EXAMINER
----------

TRAN, SUSAN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1615

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/646,852

Applicant(s)

LUNDBERG ET AL.

Examiner

Susan T. Tran

Art Unit

1615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10,12-18,20 and 23-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10,12-18,20 and 23-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                      |                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____                                                          | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 3, 6-8, 12-18, 20 and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nara et al. US 6,245,351, in view of Hodges et al. US 5,225,202.

Nara teaches a controlled release composition comprising a drug-containing core coated with a coating composition containing a water-insoluble substance and a swellable polymer (abstract, column 1, lines 50-63). Drugs include omeprazole and lansoprazole, are mixed with excipient, such as sucrose or calcium phosphate (osmotic agent); binder; disintegrant, such as, sodium crosslinked carboxymethylcellulose or low-substitutional hydroxypropyl cellulose (swelling agent); and lubricant, including talc (alkaline additive) (column 3, lines 59-61; column 5, lines 36-52). Core can be in the

Art Unit: 1615

form of granule, fine granule, or inert carrier particles include sucrose (column 5, lines 30-35, and 60-65). The water-insoluble substance contained in the coating composition includes ethyl cellulose, cellulose acetate, and Eudragit RS (column 4, lines 5-25; and column 6, lines 15-25). The coating composition further comprises talc (modifying agent) (column 6, lines 50-55; and example 3). The examples show the weight of coating composition is about 20-30% to the core. The coated core can be prepared in tablet or capsule form for oral administration (column 6, lines 56-65; and claim 7).

It is noted that Nara does not explicitly teach the weight ratio of the modifying agent to water-insoluble substance, as well as the amount of the alkaline additive and swelling agent in the core. However, generally, differences in concentration will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration is critical. Where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to, by routine experimentation determine suitable amount of talc in the core composition as well as in the coating composition, because Nara teaches the release rate of the active ingredient is mainly in the small and large intestine without an enteric coating, while the release rate of the active ingredient is very limited in the stomach (column 1, lines 53-55; and column 7, lines 25-31), and because Nara teaches a coated formulation with low toxicity that can be safely used in human. The expected result would be a controlled-release composition comprising omeprazole in the core without

Art Unit: 1615

enteric coating that can limit release of omeprazole in the stomach, but increases release in the small and large intestine.

Nara does not explicitly teach the amount of alkaline additive present in the core.

Hodges teaches a controlled release pellet comprising acid labile drug in the core, and one or more buffering agents (alkaline additives) (see abstract, and column 3, lines 1-4; lines 15-19). Buffering agents present in the core in an amount ranging from about 1 to about 20% (column 3, lines 34-36). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use alkaline additive in an amount taught by Hodges to obtain a stable acid labile composition, because Hodges teaches using buffering agent in an amount of about 1 to about 20% to aid in minimizing drug degradation in the core due to acid ingress in low pH environments (column 3, lines 6-9), and because Nara teaches a composition with low toxicity and can be safely used in mammals.

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nara et al. US 6,245,351, in view of Hodges et al. and Zentner US 4,795,644 or Lundberg et al. 6,013,281.

Nara and Hodges are relied upon for the reason stated above. Hodges is silent as to the claimed alkaline agent.

Zentner teaches pH modifying agent includes sodium mono- or di-phosphate (column 8, lines 3-15).

Lundberg teaches alkaline reacting compound includes arginine (column 6, lines 50-55). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the

Art Unit: 1615

compositions of Nara and Hodges using sodium mono- or di-phosphate and arginine compound as an alkaline agent, because the references teach suitable composition for the same active agent, namely, omeprazole.

Claims 4, 5 and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nara et al. US 6,245,351, in view of Hodges et al., and Cotton et al. WO 98/54171.

Nara and Hodges are relied upon for the reason stated above. Nara is deficient in the fact that Nara does not specifically teach magnesium salt of omeprazole.

Cotton teaches novel form of S-enantiomer of omeprazole, including S-omeprazole, and more specifically, magnesium salt of S-omeprazole trihydrate (hereafter, the compound) (see abstract, and page 1, lines 4-10). Cotton also teaches the compound is formulated into oral dosage form, e.g., capsule, tablet, and the like (page 6, lines 15-30). The formulation is effective as a gastric acid secretion inhibitor and is useful as an anti-ulcer agent (page 6, lines 1-14).

Cotton does not explicitly teaches the compound having a crystallinity of more than 70%, however, Cotton teaches that the compound of his invention is highly crystalline, i.e., having a higher crystallinity than any other form of magnesium salt of S-omeprazole in the prior art (page 3, lines 24 through page 4, lines 1-7). Therefore, the burden is shifted to applicant to show the compound taught by Cotton does not have the crystallinity being claimed. It is also noted that Cotton teaches the trihydrate form, e.g., magnesium salt of S-omeprazole "trihydrate". However, applicant claims recite a

Art Unit: 1615

generic form of magnesium salt of S-omeprazole with the transitional phrase "comprising of" permits any other form, including "trihydrate" taught by Cotton. Thus, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the controlled release composition comprising a drug-containing core coated with a *non-enteric* coating composition using the magnesium salt of S-omeprazole trihydrate in view of the teaching of Cotton, because Cotton teaches the compound of his invention is more stable, easier to handle and store, easier to synthesize in a reproducible manner, because Cotton teaches the compound is most preferred in oral administration formulation, because Nara teaches a non-enteric coated formulation with low toxicity that can be safely used in human. The expected result would be a controlled-release composition comprising omeprazole in the core without enteric coating that can limit release of omeprazole in the stomach, but increases release in the small and large intestine.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 09/15/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Nara does not teach the desirability to obtain a stable acid labile formulation. In response to applicant's argument that the reference fails to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the feature upon which applicant relies (i.e., a stable acid labile formulation) is not recited in the rejected claims.

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the

specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant argues that Nara does not teach the amount of alkaline additive in the core. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Nara is cited in view of Hodges. Hodges teaches a controlled release pellet comprising acid labile drug in the core, and one or more buffering agents (alkaline additives) (see abstract, and column 3, lines 1-4; lines 15-19). Buffering agents present in the core in an amount ranging from about 1 to about 20% (column 3, lines 34-36).

Applicant argues that the omeprazole compound of the claimed invention would be degraded and rendered therapeutically ineffective if released at the pH values taught by Hodges. It is noted that the rejected claims do not restrict the release of omeprazole at any pH values. Furthermore, Hodges is relied upon for the teachings within the four-wall patent, Hodges cannot be limited to his best mode as described in the examples.

Applicant argues that Hodges does not recognize the problem solved by the claimed invention which is directed to oral dosage forms which are not enteric-coated. In response to applicant's arguments against Hodges individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).



Applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine Nara and Hodges. In response to applicant's argument that there is no motivation to combine Nara and Hodges, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Hodges is cited solely for the teaching that buffering agent can be used in the core in an amount effective to minimize drug degradation in the core. It is noted that the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Nara and Hodges to obtain the claimed invention, because Nara teaches the use of the claimed alkaline additives (such as talc), and because Hodges teaches the use of alkaline additives in an effective amount to minimize drug degradation.

Applicant argues that there would have been no motivation at the time the claimed invention was made to combine Nara and Hodges to arrive at the claimed invention. Thus, neither Zentner nor Lundberg overcomes the failure of the combination

Art Unit: 1615

of Nara and Hodges to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. However, as discussed above, Hodges is cited solely for the teaching that buffering agent can be used in the core in an amount effective to minimize drug degradation in the core. Nara does not teach the claimed specific alkaline agent. Zentner or Lundberg is relied upon solely for the teaching of the specific alkaline agent.

Applicant argues that Cotton does not overcome the deficiencies of Nara and Hodges. In response to applicant's argument, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). Cotton is cited solely for the teaching of magnesium salt of S-omeprazole trihydrate effective as a gastric acid secretion inhibitor and is useful as an anti-ulcer agent (page 6, lines 1-14).

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

### ***Correspondence***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan T. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-0606. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward can be reached on (571) 272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 1615

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Tran', with a long horizontal line extending to the left.

S. Tran  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1615